

### REMARKS

The present application has been carefully studied and amended in view of the outstanding Office Action dated May 9, 2003, and action on the merits is now believed to be in order.


Applicant respectfully transgresses the restriction requirement between the method of claims 1-9 and the apparatus of claims 10-27. Both the method the apparatus are closely related to one another and therefore should be examined in a single application. The fields of search are overlapping in many respects and similar issues must be addressed in determining patentability. Moreover, a single prosecution history should be generated as opposed to multiple prosecution histories if the restriction requirement is maintained. It is therefore requested that in the interest of economy and given the allowable discretion that the restriction requirement be withdrawn. However, in accordance with required practice applicant elects the apparatus invention and finds claims 10-27 readable thereon.

Applicant also notes the requirement for an election of species with regard to species I - IV identified in the Action. Here again it is believed that all of the species are closely related and should be examined in this application, but as required, applicant elects species I as illustrated in Figure 1 of the drawing. The claims readable on elected species I include claims 10-21, 23, 24 and 26. Remaining claims 22, 25 and 27 read on species II, III and IV, respectively.

In view of the above elections, it is now believed that the application is in condition for action on the merits and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE AND HUTZ LLP

By 

Richard M. Beck

Reg. No. 22,580

Telephone: 302 658-9141

RMB/alh/269647